

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are currently pending, with claims 1, 8, 14 and 15 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 8, 9, 14 and 15 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, at pg. 8, lines 7-12 and 15-17 of the originally filed specification. The amendment to claim 9 clarifies the wording of the claim, and is cosmetic in nature. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated July 25, 2006, independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 15, and dependent claims 2-7, 9-13 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,301,471 (“*Dahm*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,732,074 (“*Spaur*”). For the following reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims of the present application are patentable over the cited reference.

Independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended to recite the limitations “wherein the interface module determines whether the mobile terminal is configured to display the received data; and wherein the decoded data is displayed on the remote output device if the mobile terminal is not configured to display the received data”. The combination of *Dahm* and *Spaur* fails to teach this aspect of the claimed invention.

Dahm relates to a system and method which permits mobile service providers to identify subscribers who may be at risk to churning, and once identified, present those identified with an opportunity to review and execute an upgraded service plan better suited to their needs (see col. 3, lines 53-59). *Dahm* states, “the system and method allows the identified mobile subscribers to efficiently, visually and interactively, review the offered mobile service plan better meeting the subscriber's needs. The subscriber can review and execute the offer using the display and interface of a mobile device” (see Abstract). However, *Dahm* fails to teach or suggest that an “interface module determines whether the mobile terminal is configured to display the received data, [where] the decoded data is displayed on the remote output device if the mobile terminal is not configured to display the received data”, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 14.

Dahm (col. 9, lines 17-22) states, “mobile device 250 includes a corresponding WCP interface 252 that couples to wireless network 245 via a RF transceiver (not shown) to receive incoming and outgoing data signals. It is understandable that WCP interface 252 is implemented with a UDP interface, as does WCP interface 206, when wireless network 245 operates HDTP.”

Dahm (col. 9, lines 22-25) further states, when “other wireless communication protocol is operated in wireless network 245, both WCP interface 252 and WCP interface 206 are readily implemented accordingly so that proxy server 200 and mobile device 250 can understand and communicate [with] each other.” In addition, *Dahm* (col. 9, lines 28-29) states, “device identifier (ID) storage 254 supplies a device ID to UDP interface 252. *Dahm* (col. 9, lines 39-45) also teaches that the client module 256 is coupled to UDP interface 252 for the establishment of a communication session and the requesting and receiving of data”. Additionally, the client module 256 operates, among other things, a browser 264, commonly referred to as micro-browser, requiring much less computing power and memory than well-known HTML browsers do.

Dahm (col. 9, lines 28-41) states, “device identifier (ID) storage 254 supplies a device ID to UDP interface 252. The device ID identifies a specific code that is associated with mobile device 250 and directly corresponds to the device ID in the user account provided in proxy server device 200. In addition, mobile device 250 includes a client module 256 that performs many of the processing tasks performed by mobile device 250 including establishing a communication session with proxy server device 200, requesting and receiving data from carrier network 208, displaying information on a display screen 260 thereof, and receiving user input from keypad 262 as well. The client module 256 is coupled to UDP interface 252 for the establishment of a communication session and the requesting and receiving of data”. That is, (col. 9, lines 17-41) teaches nothing more than the internal configuration of the disclosed mobile station. Thus, *Dahm* teaches aspects associated with establishing a communication session. However, there is nothing with respect to determining which device should display received data.

Dahm (col. 9, lines 58-60) states, “information is exchanged between mobile device 402 and proxy server 404 upon establishment of a communications session between the two devices”. *Dahm* (col. 60-65) teaches that the communications session is conducted using a wireless communications protocol, such as Wireless Access Protocol (WAP) or Handheld Device Transport Protocol (HDTP). However, *Dahm* fails to teach that the determination is performed with respect to an interface module that determines whether the mobile terminal is configured to display the received data (i.e., whether the mobile terminal is WAP enabled), where the decoded data is displayed on the remote access device if the mobile terminal is not configured to display the received data. In *Dahm*, the data is output to the display of the mobile station at all times. That is, there is no determination with respect to where the information should be displayed.

The Examiner concedes *Dahm* fails to teach or suggest an output device “remotely located from the mobile terminal”. *Spaur* has been cited to provide this feature. However, Applicant’s review of *Spaur* reveals that the only relevant feature taught by *Spaur* is a computer terminal (60) attached to a modem (64). However, there is nothing in *Spaur* with respect to the additional features recited in amended claims 1 and 14. Thus, *Spaur* fails to cure the deficiency of *Dahm*. In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 14 are patentable over the combination of *Dahm* and *Spaur* and, thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are in order, and a notice to that effect is requested.

Independent claims 8 and 15 are method claims associated with independent system claims 1 and 14, respectively. Accordingly, independent claims 8 and 15 are patentable over *Dahm* for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent system claims 1 and 14.

In view of the patentability of independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 15, for the reasons set forth above, dependent claims 2-7, 9-13 and 16-19 are all patentable over the prior art.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should be in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is requested.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By



Alphonso A. Collins
Reg. No. 43,559
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: September 18, 2006